R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 429 AC 001 308

DAYTIME SCHOOL FOR ADULTS, A NEW PROGRAM DIMENSION AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA/BERKELEY, WITH A REACTION BY VIRGINIA BULLARD, DIRECTOR OF DAYTIME PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY.

BY- GORDON, MORTON
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUC. FOR ADULTS

REPORT NUMBER CSLEA-OP-15 PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60 40P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DAYTIME PROGRAMS, *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, *EVALUATION, ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, WOMENS EDUCATION, VOLUNTEERS, FACULTY RECRUITMENT, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, COLLEGE CREDITS, FINANCIAL POLICY, NONCREDIT COURSES, PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT, PROGRAM CONTENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, BROOKLINE, BOSTON UNIVERSITY

IN 1964, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION SET UP AN AUTONOMOUS DAYTIME PROGRAM WHICH NOW OFFERS 100 CLASSES, CONFERENCES, AND LECTURE PROGRAMS IN FOUR LOCATIONS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA. HOW THE DAYTIME STAFF FACED PROBLEMS OF ACADEMIC CREDIT, NEED FOR RISK CAPITAL IN AN INNOVATIVE EFFORT, AND MANAGEMENT OF FACULTY RELATIONS AND USE OF VOLUNTEERS TO REACH INTO THE COMMUNITY, FORM THE CORE OF THIS REPORT. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE DAYTIME PROGRAM AND THE REST OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ARE--NEW TYPE OF STUDENTS ARE ATTRACTED, STUDENT AND FACULTY ENERGY IS HIGH, AND FACULTY IS EASILY RECRUITED. IN THE FUTURE, INCREASED ENROLLMENTS, MORE EMPHASIS ON CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, AND EXPANDED PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN ARE ANTICIPATED. BECAUSE OF RISING COSTS, THE DAYTIME PROGRAM IS SEEKING SUPPORT FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES TO AUGMENT STUDENT FEES IN FINANCING TOP QUALITY EDUCATION. VIRGINIA BULLARD'S INSIGHTS ON THE ISSUES OF FINANCE, CREDIT, AND AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT ARE BASED ON HER EXPERIENCES WITH A SIMILAR PROGRAM AT NORTHEASTERN. THE DOCUMENT INCLUDES TABLES AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO SURVEY THE NEED FOR THE PROGRAM. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY, 138 MOUNTFORT STREET, BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02146, FOR $0.75. (AJ)

ED012429

OCCASIONAL PAPERS · NUMBER 15

DAYTIME SCHOOL FOR ADULTS

A New Program Dimension At University of California/Berkeley

MORTON GORDON

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
at Boston University

AC001 308E

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

A special series devoted to documents which, though prepared in a specific context and for a limited audience, are judged to be of such general interest that they merit wider distribution than that for which they were originally intended. They are presented in the hope that they will contribute to the more general sharing of information and opinion about questions of importance in the field of liberal education for adults.

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports,* and *Occasional Papers.*

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS *AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY*

138 Mountfort St.

Brookline, Mass. 02146

$ .75

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DAYTIME SCHOOL FOR ADULTS

A New Program Dimension At University of California/Berkeley

Morton Gordon

Director, University Extension
University of California/Berkeley

with a reaction by
VIRGINIA BULLARD
Director of Daytime Programs for Adults
Northeastern University

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1967 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY James Whipple

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

INTRODUCTION

After three years of watching the gratifying growth of the Daytime Program of University Extension at the University of California at Berkeley, Morton Gordon reports in this paper on what has been wrought and how. His paper is not simply a success story, although it is certainly that, too—a dramatic account of an imaginative and vigorous effort in program development. The monograph is in large part a reflective discussion of the idea behind the project and the problems that surround it.

To Gordon, the Daytime Program was always more than an attempt to extend the use of the adult facilities to daytime hours. The program was planned and developed as a totally new dimension of the extension program at Berkeley. The aim was to let the program pursue its own identity, to discover and serve the special needs of the daytime audience (which turned out to be a rather different group from the evening audience), and to do this in a style peculiarly its own. In seeking these ends, the staff encountered problems common to most adult education programs. How the Daytime staff faced and dealt with such problems as the general ambivalence about credit, the need for risk capital in an innovative effort, management of faculty relations, the use of volunteers to expand the potential reach into the community—these matters form the core of Gordon's report. Adult educators should find some useful insights into program building in his story, especially concerning the possibilities in a daytime program.

To help underline the general application of the experience at Berkeley, we invited a reaction from another educator concerned with an adult day program—Virginia Bullard, Director of Women's Programs at Northeastern University. Although the Northeastern program is in some ways different from the one described by Gordon (the students are degree-oriented, the university is private, the location is the East coast) her experience is very similar to

that of her colleagues in California. She adds insight on the issues raised—money, credit, and audience involvement as experienced in the Northeastern program. And her hopeful attitude reinforces Gordon's concluding optimistic note about the future of the daytime program.

A. A. Liveright

July 1967

DAYTIME SCHOOL FOR ADULTS: A NEW PROGRAM DIMENSION AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA/BERKELEY

Until three years ago, nearly all of University of California Extension's activities had been conducted "after the lights go on"—during evening hours when University and other facilities are available for continuing education programs and when adults traditionally attend such programs. Today, although the major portion of Extension's program is still scheduled for the evening, more than a hundred classes, conferences, workshops, and lecture programs are offered during the daytime in four locations in the San Francisco Bay Area. This Daytime Program of University Extension has enrolled more than six thousand adult students since it was begun in 1964. The Program is a new and expanding dimension of university adult education.

For seventy-five years University Extension has conducted an adult education program, linking the University and its resources with the people and the communities of the state and offering a wide range of classes and other programs in nearly every academic discipline. In the year 1965-1966, enrollment at Extension centers throughout the state exceeded 200,000.

During the mid-1950's, Extension's program began to change. Since then it has moved away from emphasis on undergraduate credit programs and has placed increasing emphasis on continuing education for adults who are already well educated or otherwise qualified professionally or vocationally, adults who wish to pursue some of the "liberating" aspects of continuing education.[1]

---

1. The shift is a consequence, in part, of the fact that a sharply increasing percentage of Extension students have already earned an undergraduate degree. Other students have attended college for one or more years but have no immediate desire to earn a degree. Of course, University Extension continues to offer undergraduate credit classes for adults interested in a degree, but these programs constitute a decreasing proportion of the total program.

Today, the major objectives of University Extension are these:

1. to update the knowledge and skills of adults employed in technical and professional occupations;
2. to provide opportunities for continuing liberal education;
3. to increase individual citizen understanding and competence about important social, political, economic issues of our time;
4. to provide educational and consulting services to public and private agencies attempting to resolve significant social and environmental problems.

These far-reaching goals require that University Extension function not simply as "an extension" of the University and the campus, but also as an academic entity which can interpret the educational needs of adults living in an increasingly urban and constantly changing physical and cultural environment, an environment which requires innovation in educational programming.

The Daytime Program of University Extension is one such innovation which has enlarged considerably the opportunities for continuing liberal education. It was established in 1964 with thirty-six classes at the University of California Extension Center in San Francisco, a facility of the Berkeley campus devoted exclusively to University Extension programs. Five hundred adults enrolled in these courses. By the fall of 1966 it was offering a total of more than a hundred classes, conferences, workshops, and other programs in four Bay Area locations. Thirteen hundred adults were enrolled in these programs. Of the more than 6,000 adults who, in just short of three years, had enrolled in daytime programs, we believe that as many as 4,000 of them would not have engaged in any continuing education activity if opportunities had not been provided during the day.

In the fall of 1963, University Extension appointed a special assistant to determine the feasibility of holding daytime classes at the San Francisco Extension Center.[2] The center consists of forty modern class and seminar rooms, and lecture halls seating several hundred. (It also provides parking for 250 cars—a rare extra for a downtown Extension facility!) Located a few minutes from San Francisco's central business district, it is easily accessible from the major freeways that lead to all the population centers in the Bay Area.

---

2. Mrs. Jeanne Brewer, former Director of Foundation Relations at the University of Chicago, agreed to accept a half-time appointment for six months.

In 1963, the San Francisco Extension Center was—and it still is—a lighted beehive of educational activity every weekday evening. Thousands of adults attended the many programs offered and had done so in increasing numbers since the center was opened in 1957. During the day, however, except for an occasional Saturday or Sunday when a weekend conference was scheduled, the center was empty. One must admit that the first impulse to develop a daytime program came from a desire to use the Center's facilities to a greater extent than had been possible until then.

In 1963, we assumed there were many adults in the Bay Area with sufficient interest and leisure to enroll in Extension daytime programs, adults who for one reason or another could not attend evening sessions. No one knew who these potential students were and whether they would enroll in numbers large enough to support a program. The few attempts to offer daytime programs at the center shortly after it opened in 1958 had met with little success. The early experiments were all short-term, and had little or no risk capital to support them long enough to test the validity of the experiment. Programs had been isolated and tentative, and no pattern of growth, or success or failure, could be discerned. Even the evening program, successful from the outset, was too untested to serve as a base from which to launch a new and financially risky venture.

Yet, by 1963, the center was one of the largest of its kind in the nation. It offered many educational activities for adults in the evening hours—lectures, conferences, concerts, art exhibits, and films, as well as classes. The time and circumstances seemed right for the development of a new program.

SURVEYING THE DAYTIME FIELD

Initial efforts to identify and reach the potential daytime students and understand their interests were based upon the following assumptions:

1. Adults would enroll in a daytime program of classes, seminars, and other activities that emphasized arts- and letters-subject matter.
2. The vast majority of participants would be women.
3. Participants would have educational backgrounds similar to

other University Extension students, 85 per cent of whom have one or more years of college, and 60 per cent of whom have a college degree.

Surveying the need, the staff first considered all the usual caveats about a survey by questionnaire: you do not know who your audience is, so how can you decide whom to survey; respondents are polite and full of desire to be helpful, so they will tell you what they believe you want to hear; they will profess a deep need for education but will not register in programs in which they express interest; thousands of questionnaires will be sent and many returned and analyzed, at great cost, including time and energy, but an experienced Extension staff member could learn just as much discussing the problems with colleagues; the arguments were many. But, despite prophecies of less than wild success, a survey by questionnaire was made, for two reasons: (1) it was hoped that the questionnaire itself would stimulate community interest in the daytime program and would serve as advance promotion for courses and programs to be offered later; (2) the questionnaire would provide a basis, an excuse, to get organizations whose members were potential students involved in program development. Furthermore, even the most implacable pessimist on the staff conceded that the questionnaire might yield some useful information.

Working closely with local organizations, the staff won cooperation from officers who wrote letters to members describing the survey and encouraging participation. A total of 5,632 questionnaires (a sample questionnaire is given in the appendix) was distributed to individuals who, because of their professional and voluntary affiliations, seemed likely to respond. The questionnaires were designed with the assistance of the University of California Survey Research Center. The staff hoped to learn more about the following:

1. The educational background of potential students;
2. Whether they were committed in some way to their own continuing education;
3. What academic fields they were interested in;
4. Whether they were interested in a daytime program;
5. What days and times would be most convenient: Monday, Friday, Saturday, early morning, late afternoon, etc.

There was a 28 per cent return (1,576) of the questionnaire; budgetary limitations prevented a follow-up of the 72 per cent who did not re-

ply. Those who took the time to respond, responded enthusiastically. In addition to marking the boxes, some respondents wrote comments in the margins. Some of the most significant responses were the following: 1,100 said they planned to continue their education. There was strong interest in art programs, foreign language study, and humanities in general. More than 50 per cent had not enrolled previously in University Extention programs. A surprisingly high preference was expressed for Saturday, and even for Sunday, programs—484 said they would be interested in Sunday classes! There was a much higher male response than anticipated (males, 539; females, 1001). Some members of the staff had been concerned that so few men would indicate interest that the program would soon be identified as exclusively a women's program—which it was never intended to be.

The 20-40 age group, who usually participate most heavily in University Extension programs, were very well represented (about 63 per cent). The under-20 group, expectedly small, comprised about 7 per cent; the over-40 group, 26 per cent.

A puzzling response received was the large number of requests from men for courses in professional and vocational fields other than their own.

The results of the survey were far more favorable than anyone associated with the program had dared hope. Thus, in November 1963, when the questionnaires were still being studied in detail, the decision was made to inaugurate a daytime program in February 1964, the opening of Extension's spring semester. The decision may have seemed precipitous, perhaps even ill-founded, to some observers. Certainly more data on prospective students and faculty would have been helpful. Promotion of a new program is always difficult and should be carefully planned and plotted. Yet to be solved were all the administrative problems attendant on a new project, including the program's place within a very large—and on the whole well-functioning—evening extension division.

Notwithstanding these arguments, the staff believed that the need for a daytime program was pressing and that enough was known to begin operations on a small scale, with due regard for the insights which an experimental program could be made to yield.

The Daytime Program in San Francisco (later, when it expanded to the Berkeley campus, it became simply "The Daytime Program") was organized as a separate department of University of California Extension, Berkeley. The purpose of this status was to assist the Program to develop its own identity as a new unit of University Extension; it was not to be an offshoot—and, therefore, inevitably an afterthought—of an already existing Extension department. The department head and staff were free to make their own mistakes and learn from them. They were in a position to cherish each enrollee as a personal triumph of creativity over adversity. The staff was authorized—as other Extension departments are not—to operate on a deficit basis for a two- to three-year period, at the end of which the Program had to be supported wholly from fees. In short, although the Daytime staff (a director and one assistant both working full-time) had access to the services of Extension administrative departments (accounting, payroll, promotion, etc.), and was free to use experienced evening class programmers in other Extension academic departments as unpaid consultants, the decisions were theirs to make. We believed that if the Daytime Program had its own staff, its own goals, timetable and "production quotas," and its own budget, it would have a better chance to develop a creative program and eventual financial viability.

THE FIRST PROGRAM

A catalog for the Daytime Program was published early in January 1964, announcing thirty-six classes. Twenty-eight of these were in arts and letters and were planned by the Daytime Program staff. Eight courses were planned by other Extension academic departments—Business Administration, Social Welfare, and Letters and Science. Classes were offered Monday through Saturday and were scheduled from 9:00 a.m. through late afternoon.

The new program was formally presented to the press and public at a luncheon held at the San Francisco Extension Center. This meeting and the mailing of 40,000 copies of the catalog were followed by a large number of press releases, some newspaper advertisements, minimal radio and television announcements, and a very considerable effort by the Daytime staff in making contacts, by phone and in person, and through talks before local groups.

Enrollments began to come in. The composition of the student body —and its size—came as a surprise to Extension personnel. We had anticipated an enrollment of about 250 students, almost all women. Instead, 500 enrolled, and 200 of these were men, mostly entrepreneurs who presumably could say, "Watch the store, I'm taking a few hours off." There were also many business and professional people who took advantage of the Saturday and late afternoon programs. As expected, most of the women who enrolled had had two or three years of college education which had been interrupted fifteen or twenty years ago. But there were fewer young mothers than predicted, and most of these attended Saturday classes. The Daytime Program staff had planned to arrange for pre-school child care, but found that there was not sufficient interest to justify the service. Evidently, young mothers remained home with their children during the week, but some did venture forth on Saturday.

Another surprising feature of the student body was the wide range in the ages of students—from 20 to 70—a range which contributed to some unusual and stimulating learning experiences. In studio art classes, for example, instructors were delighted with the effect that younger participants had on the older ones. Conservative older students tended to become freer, more daring, by following the lead of their bolder, "far-out" classmates.

The overall percentage of young people was small, however. Most were students from other institutions of higher education in the area. They reported that they had been attracted to the Daytime Program because of its distinguished faculty, or crowded classrooms and other inconveniences in their own universities, or because of the opportunity to obtain credit for courses not included in their own curricula.

THE PROBLEM OF CREDIT IN THE DAYTIME PROGRAM

The experience of the Daytime Program has shed new light on the complex question of credit for Extension programs. A large number of Daytime students already had earned Bachelor's degrees; a remarkable proportion had earned advanced degrees. Many others had had one or more years of college. There were students who reported that they had been out of school for ten, fifteen, or twenty years; still others had attended Extension courses on a more or less regular basis for years.

The perplexing point is that a large majority (65 per cent) of all daytime students, those who have degrees as well as those who do not, indicated that they prefer credit to non-credit programs.

Although University Extension is not a degree-granting institution, many of its programs carry credit which can be transferred to the schools and colleges of the campuses of the University of California and to other colleges and universities. We can understand the desire for credit of an Extension student who does not have, but wants to earn, a degree. But what is one to make of the preference for credit of an Extension student who already has a B.A., or even an M.A.?

Many Daytime Program students appear to prefer credit courses because they want to know what is expected of them and they want expectations to be high. There seems to be an assumption that if a course offers credit it will be more highly structured, more sophisticated, and more demanding. In credit courses, students expect to be asked to write a paper and take examinations at regular intervals, and they are reassured by these requirements that the educational experience will be worthwhile. In other words, the preference for credit is linked to a belief that academic standards will be uncompromisingly high.

This attitude appears to be characteristic primarily of the arts and letters programs. There are several academic departments in University Extension which program exclusively for professional people: attorneys, engineers, city planners, architects, etc. These departments report that their students are just as interested in quality education but do not press quite so hard for credit. Even in the Daytime Program, which concentrates on arts and letters, there are some interesting exceptions to the assumed equation of quality and credit.

Programs such as two seminars on public issues given in the first semester—programs that are specially designed and promoted and that offer something unavailable elsewhere in the educational community—do not suffer from being non-credit offerings. Nor do some of the highly successful studio art classes in which the results of the educational experience can be measured rather more directly in improved skill and greater facility. Still other programs which functioned quite successfully without regard to credit were Secretaries Forum '66 and Design '66, which were programs tailored for quite specific audiences.

Secretaries Forum was a two-day (Friday-Saturday) conference for senior office personnel, held in May 1966. It included workshops in such areas as the probable effect of automation on office management, problems of communication, and notes on developing perception and refining the ability to listen, as well as some light-hearted advice about how to achieve a maximum of satisfaction on the job and "what to do until the psychiatrist comes." The question of credit never arose, either among the secretary and office manager members of the program planning committee or among the nearly 350 who attended the program. Perhaps it did not because most of the audience were new to University Extension programs and because program content was mostly outside the mainstream of traditional academic learning.

This problem of credit did arise in one of the Daytime Program's most successful programs, Design '66, presented in August and September of 1966. Design '66 was an intensive two-week conference planned for teachers of design and professional interior designers. General conference sessions focused on broad issues of interior design and on new architectural and engineering trends and new design materials; small group workshops were devoted to specific topics, such as the art, materials, and economics of design. Seventy conference participants came from thirty states; ten of the participants were teachers in design fields.

Attendance at a program of this kind represents a considerable investment of time and money. It was not surprising, therefore, that a number of enrollees, primarily those in educational fields, expressed interest in obtaining some kind of credit—not necessarily traditional academic credit, but "some kind" of certification or official recognition of their participation in the conference. The staff explained to participants that while University regulations made no provision for any official recognition apart from credit, it was possible to award a "certificate of completion." A few participants reluctantly agreed to accept this as the best we could do, but it was clear that the solution was less than ideal.

RELATIONS

One aspect of the Daytime Program which has contributed greatly to its success is the quality of active support which the Program receives from students and faculty. From the start, the staff devoted a great deal of energy to establishing and maintaining two-way communication with all

students and a high degree of personal and professional involvement by faculty.

The Program has had surprisingly little difficulty in acquiring and retaining its faculty—less difficulty than other departments of University Extension. An obvious factor which helps account for this is the proximity to San Francisco State College, an institution which abounds in good teachers with creative ideas about program and course development. Another element is the general availability in the Bay Area of qualified part-time teaching personnel in the arts. And professors from the University of California and other institutions who have not been available to teach in evening programs have accepted offers to teach during the day.

Less obvious, but probably more important, is the fact that the staff has been able to transmit to the faculty a sense of the experimental and pioneering nature of the Program. More important yet, the faculty has been involved heavily in determining program goals and the means for achieving them. An environment has been established in which the faculty members feel free—and are in fact free—to propose new programs, suggest changes in existing ones, in short, to play a responsible role in the development of the program. A Daytime Program teacher can have an educational dream and make it come true within a relatively brief time—a rare occurrence indeed on a university campus today. It is <u>their</u> program, and faculty members are personally committed to its success. They have discovered, along with many other teachers in university adult education, that teaching adults who are actively engaged in their own education is often more stimulating for the instructor than teaching undergraduates.

The many artists, writers, and free-lance teachers who are qualified and available for teaching daytime classes for adults, are responsible for much of the success of the creative arts program. The quality of teaching in these classes is a major concern of participants; a large amount of individual instruction is required; students want to know in advance of registration how good the instructor is, what he has exhibited or written. Once they are convinced that a teacher is interested in their needs and meets their exacting standards of excellence, they welcome the opportunity to support and even promote a class they are enthusias-

tic about—which constitutes a kind of program promotion the Daytime Program has gone to some length to foster.

THE VOLUNTEERS

Halfway through the first semester a questionnaire was circulated among students to find out such things as: who they were, what they did or did not like about the program, and what kinds of programs they would want to have offered in the future. At about this same time, the director of the Program was asked to try to double the size of the program by the following semester. This action was taken because of the instant success of the first semester, which seemed to indicate that there was a large untapped reservoir of students; an analysis of revenue and expenditures showed that the financial health of the program depended on greatly increasing its size.

At first there seemed no relationship between the information contained in the returned questionnaires and the request to prepare a significantly larger program within a very few weeks. It was a coincidence that the two arrived in the office at the same time. But this coincidence provided the occasion for one of the happier innovations of the Daytime Program.

The staff began the hard work of putting a program together and recruiting faculty. When this was well along, and it appeared that printing and mailing deadlines would be met, the staff began to think about promotion and publicity. Precious little time remained for traditional promotion methods, and there was no confidence that these would in themselves ensure a significant increase in enrollment. The staff studied the mid-semester questionnaires and, on the assumption that the best salesman of an idea, even an educational idea, is one who is intimately involved with it, they selected twenty students who had reported that they were enthusiastic about the program. They personally contacted these students, explaining that by the next semester they wanted to double the size of the program. The startling result of these calls was that, with the exception of one student, all volunteered to help spread the word.

The staff now believes that the volunteers have been more responsible than any group for the élan of the Program, for its rapid growth and acceptance by adults, for bringing new ideas to the attention of program staff, and for its success in the hard job of building enrollment.

Table 1

PROFILE OF ENROLLEES - SPRING 1964
(434 Questionnaires Returned)

	Total
Sex	
Male	173
Female	261
Age*	
Under 20	24
20-29	105
30-39	74
40-49	72
50-59	43
60 and over	17
Marital Status	
Single	126
Married	183
Widowed, Divorced, or Separated	38
Highest Degree Earned	
High School	28
B.A.	76*
M.A.	31
Doctorate	9

*143 respondents reported they had attended college for 1-3 years, and 57 reported they had attended beyond the B.A. but had earned no M.A. or other higher degree.

The volunteers were busy people; many had families and other commitments. There was only time enough to call them together for one official meeting to explain what was planned in the fall, and to give them promotional material to distribute. They were requested simply to do what they could—distribute brochures at the doctor's office or at the laundromat, talk to neighbors and friends. They were not required to report back or to take part in any structured promotional activities. Volunteers were told, in effect: "This program is as much yours as ours. We need your help and your ideas. We trust you absolutely to do well what-

ever you think will work." Armed with staff trust and support, the volunteers worked tirelessly and to good, and often to ingenious, effect.

Today there are seventy volunteers throughout the Bay Area. All but three, who have been employed on a part-time occasional basis as registrars in the field and in other administrative capacities, are unpaid. All volunteers do, in fact, report back, with the kind of information that is extremely difficult to come by—information about communities, what their major preoccupations are, what kinds of programs might be successful, which local newspapers might carry a feature on the Daytime Program. Although the volunteers have continued to perform important promotional functions, this kind of feedback has become their most valuable contribution. It has an effect on all aspects of the program. For example, most volunteer workers enroll in Daytime classes and they talk frankly to the staff about instructors, course content, and about the kinds of courses students want. Often volunteers are able to see through what fellow students say they want to the kind of programs they actually will enroll in. The staff, which works at a greater distance, cannot always read students' intentions as accurately.

It should be pointed out that the kind of open communication, plain speaking and shared decision-making which characterizes the faculty-staff relationship is also an important factor in the volunteer program. One of the reasons for this is that volunteer workers are informed not only about the plans of the Daytime Program, but about its problems as well. They know why the fee for one course is $30 and another is $60; they know what the enrollment is and what it should be; they know which classes are successful, which are failing; and they know that their assistance makes a real difference in the outcome of the entire program, and that their devotion and help is appreciated by all interested in the Program.

EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Daytime Program in San Francisco did double its enrollment in the fall of 1964; 1,000 students enrolled in 57 classes. The following summer, programs were opened in Berkeley near the University of California campus, and in the fall of 1965 at the Civic Arts Center in Walnut Creek, a burgeoning area of 65,000 on the urban fringe of the metro-

politan Bay Area. Finally, in the fall of 1966, the program was offered in several urban centers north of San Francisco.

This rapid expansion poses some questions: How large does the Program have to be to balance out financially? How large can it be and retain its unique quality? What kind of program will best meet adult needs at an academic level appropriate to the University, and at the same time achieve financial stability?

Daytime Program Enrollments, 1964-1966

	Total (all locations)
Spring 1964	500
Fall 1964	1,100
Spring 1965	700
Fall 1965	1,200
Spring 1966	1,600
Fall 1966	1,300

University Extension as a whole receives about 7 per cent of its total budget from state funds. Since there are certain administrative costs that must be funded to maintain Extension offices throughout the State, program departments such as the Daytime Program must be supported completely by student fees. When the Daytime Program was initiated, it was given a maximum of three years to achieve financial solvency; that is, it received the extraordinary permission to "lose money" over a three-year period. We were fortunate to be able to afford the lead time which we knew would be necessary to put the Berkeley Program on a fee-supported basis.[3]

Financial projections indicate that during fiscal 1966-67, the Daytime Program will come close to meeting its goals. The deficit incurred

---

3. All of us associated with the Daytime Program owe a vote of thanks to Dean Paul H. Sheats for his support. As statewide Dean of University Extension, he is affected more than anyone in the system by constant financial pressures. Despite these problems, Dean Sheats had confidence enough in the idea to authorize a deficit; without the authorization there would have been no Daytime Program. We were fortunate also to have the support of Professor Edward B. Roessler, then Director of University Extension, Northern Area, now statewide Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

during the first year's operation has been greatly reduced, and there are encouraging signs which suggest that the break-even point is not far off.[4] It is also true that certain benefits have accrued to Extension that may be said to offset continuing deficits. For instance, it is difficult to determine how many students who are attracted initially to the Daytime Program may subsequently enroll in other University Extension programs. We know that some have already enrolled in evening programs. In other words, a part of the Daytime Program's deficit could be justified as direct promotion expense for other Extension departments, or as a kind of institutional advertisement for all of Extension.

One has the right to be optimistic about the future of the Daytime Program, in spite of the fact that the long-term financial outlook for University Extension is not bright. Costs continue to rise, and there are pressures to reduce the level of state support. University Extension's 7 per cent level of state support is already lower than that received by any large state university and almost all smaller publicly supported institutions of higher education. In these circumstances, it has become clear that the Daytime Program must raise its average program enrollment to about forty. But an enrollment of this size would destroy the educational impact of many classes; indeed, one of the most valuable characteristics of much of the class program has been the close student-faculty and student-student relationship which is possible only in small classes.

A good example of these small classes are the Daytime Seminars for Adults. These seminars are offered as an unusual opportunity to venture beyond formal curricula into broad study areas especially adapted to mature interests. Not tied to examinations, grades, or credit requirements, their essence is dialogue, a free and active exchange of ideas among participants with diverse backgrounds and experiences. These seminars are very expensive to plan and administer. The fees are relatively high ($60), but since enrollment is limited to twenty—as it should be if an appropriate quality of learning is to take place—there is no possibility of recovering costs. The contradiction between educational and financial goals is plain.

The solution to the problem lies in a flexible attitude toward the

4. See below for a discussion of some of the consequences of a policy of self-support, e.g., wholly supported by students' fees.

Table 2

PROFILE OF ENROLLEES - SPRING 1966
(828 Questionnaires Returned)

	Total	San Francisco	Other Locations
Enrollment	1605	1129	476
Sex			
Male	151	101	50
Female	519	205	314
Age			
Under 20	16	12	4
20-29	225	135	90
30-39	172	90	82
40-49	190	94	96
50-59	108	43	65
60 and over	54	29	25
Marital Status			
Single	177	115	62
Married	517	242	275
Widowed, Divorced, or Separated	72	44	28
Highest Degree Earned			
High School	250	136	114
B.A.	211*	60	151
M.A.	86	41	45
Doctorate	8	5	3
Prefer Credit Courses			
Yes	399	220	179
No	286	137	149

*259 respondents reported they attended college for 4 years, 91 for 3 years, 130 for 2 years, and 50 for 1 year.

manner in which the average of forty is achieved. It is obvious that if the Daytime Program is to continue to offer certain classes with enrollments of fifteen or twenty, other classes will have to have quite large enrollments, or some special low-cost elements, or high income poten-

tial with small enrollments. In fact, some programs aimed at attaining for the entire Daytime Program the financial equivalent of forty per class have already been developed.

One of the classes which may help us achieve a high overall Program enrollment is Great Cities of the World, a lecture-discussion series which deals with current political, economic, and cultural developments in some of the major cities of the world. The need for the program was suggested by the great increase in travel by Americans, both within the United States and abroad. The program is intended primarily for people planning to travel or for those who have recently returned. But it is not a superficial popular travelog. Rather, prominent artists, authors and other authorities who have lived and worked in the cities under consideration conduct serious and scholarly discussions about the greatness of cities and about what makes them so. This is good education that attracts participants who are looking for more out of travel than a set of color photos. Unlike most class programs, Great Cities of the World can accommodate a large enrollment and does not require long-term commitments from the faculty, each of whom is responsible for only four sessions. The large enrollment means that funds become available to support low-enrollment programs; the short-term commitment makes it easier, that is, less costly in administrative time, to recruit faculty.

The Daytime art program is perhaps the outstanding example of the kind of imaginative programming that meets a large audience demand and makes excellent use of both faculty and physical facilities. Two art courses were offered during the first semester of operation. Now there are more than forty art classes ranging from art history lecture courses to an array of studio classes in sculpture, painting, drawing, and design. Of particular note is the fact that no course in this series has a campus counterpart. All are specially designed for an adult audience.

Undoubtedly, one of the major reasons for the program's success is the fact that some of the most accomplished artists in the area serve on the faculty. Another element is a tremendous resurgence of interest in art and art participation which has taken place throughout the nation. Perhaps more than in any other creative field, adults feel that it is possible for them to participate in art. It is also true that, compared with

some other kinds of creative endeavor such as photography, the initial investment in materials and equipment is not high.

These factors help to explain why so many beginning art students enroll in Daytime classes. The Program also provides an interesting and unusual opportunity for more advanced students who, as city dwellers, cannot always find a place to work. Uninstructed Laboratory is a program for those who do not necessarily need or want an instructor but simply a place where they can work, uninterrupted, for a period of time.[5] In 1965, the Daytime Program opened two large rooms in an unused building at the San Francisco Extension Center and established the laboratory, which provides three-hour work periods, a model whose expense can be distributed among the ten or twelve participants, and a monitor representing the administration. The fee for Uninstructed Laboratory is about half that of an instructed class, and although enrollment is limited to maintain a productive atmosphere, it is the kind of low-cost program that requires relatively little administrative effort, and at the same time meets an important need.

Two other successful and lucrative programs have already been mentioned. Secretaries Forum '66 was a spectacular success in several respects: 350 participants were introduced to a university adult education program and were enthusiastic about what they learned. Many are planning to come back for more, to Extension classes offered by Daytime and other departments, and to succeeding programs for office personnel (Secretaries Forum '67 was held in April 1967). Although the fee for the 1966 program was modest ($30), enrollment was high and the financial outcome was good.

Design '66 was a program aimed primarily at practicing professionals. It too was successful and more like it dealing with the design fields are planned. Enrollment in Design '66 was not very high (70), but the fee was substantial ($175), and once again, the financial outcome was good.

The one conspicuous disappointment has been the summer program. Relatively small enrollment during these months means that although costs, particularly fixed overhead, continued unabated for twelve months each year, substantial revenue comes in for only nine or ten months.

5. The idea for this course came from the Department of Arts and Humanities, University Extension, University of California, Los Angeles, a department that has had spectacular success with its art program.

There are several explanations for this. To begin with, all Extension departments have summer daytime offerings, and the Daytime Program has a special problem of maintaining its identity. Then, too, many Daytime Program students, particularly women with children, use the summer for purposes other than education. The Daytime summer program has been small and tentative thus far. The staff has not found the answers to the problems of summer programming, but further experimental efforts are planned.

A NEW DIMENSION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

Three years have elapsed since the first conversations took place at University Extension, Berkeley, about the Daytime Program. It might be well to pause at this point to examine critically what has gone before and make some educated guesses about the future.

To begin with, it would be useful to describe how the Daytime Program differs from other University of California Extension programs. The most obvious difference—the time of day—hardly seems worth noting. It would be of little interest to learn that University Extension was offering during daytime hours its "regular" evening program to the same students with the same educational results; the time of day alone, therefore, does not mean very much. And, although there are undeniable advantages to utilizing classroom and conference facilities throughout more hours of the day and so reducing fixed overhead costs per student, that is not what the new program has been about either.

The following seem to be the Daytime Program's significant differences from the rest of University Extension:

New students. A new area of educational service to the community has been developed. We know that between 60 and 70 per cent of the daytime students never before attended a University of California Extension program. Since University Extension programs have been offered—in the evening—for decades, it is reasonable to conclude that because of the Daytime Program, thousands of adults have been added to the audience for continuing education programs.

Attentive students. Evening programs have been criticized, sometimes with justification, on the ground that faculty and students are mentally and physically tired and cannot do their best work. It is said that

both groups have been occupied with other things during the day, and that faculty members and students go to extension programs after all else of importance has been done. In other words, continuing education is not part of the regular tempo of their lives. Daytime learning, on the other hand, is part of the regular pattern of living, and so is daytime teaching. Attention and energy are both at high daytime levels. Faculty and students can give the best they have.

Ease of faculty recruitment. Compared to the problems which evening program staff encounter in faculty recruitment, programmers of daytime activities have had an easy time of it. A faculty is available to teach. In fact, several of the daytime faculty originally came to the program on their own initiative—a rare occurrence in University Extension!

The faculty for the first semester was recruited almost entirely from instructors in other Extension departments who agreed to teach an additional course. Since then, the Program has come to rely increasingly on its "own" faculty, who become, in time, familiar with the Program's goals and methods of operation.

Student volunteers. The use of student volunteers is surely unique. Volunteers contribute ideas for programs, assist in faculty recruitment, inform students about the program and help them enroll—all this and more constitute a healthy departure from the routine way in which these things have been done in other programs.

Administrative theory and practice. Perhaps the most important way in which the Program differs is in its administrative theory and practice. Students, student volunteers, faculty, Daytime Program professional, administrative and clerical staff—all share in determining and implementing policy. Of course, the final responsibility for decisions cannot be and is not delegated; it rests with the Daytime Program staff. But all involved do participate heavily in the decision-making process about such matters as educational needs and what shall be offered where to meet them, who shall be invited to teach, program evaluation, plans for the future, financial management—in short, all aspects of the Program. Faculty, students, and staff trust and value each other's views, feel that the Daytime Program belongs to all of them; and it does; and it is a better program because of this high degree of commitment to common purposes.

Having described how the Daytime Program started, expanded, prospered, experienced and overcame financial difficulty, managing at the same time to develop and preserve some unique qualities, it now remains to consider what the future of the Program holds.

1. Increased Enrollments. Certainly there will be more of the same. If staff energies, faculty resources, and physical plant permit, enrollment can be doubled at least once more. It will be difficult to expand to that degree and maintain all the intimate, "handmade" characteristics of the Program, but we believe it can be done.

2. Professional Programs. The Daytime Program has not yet provided very many opportunities for those interested in improving their professional and vocational competence. We believe there are many adults who would enroll in programs of continuing professional education offered during daytime hours. The first step is to solicit the involvement and support of the business and professional communities. In the next three to five years, programs for business and the professions could become as important a part of the Daytime Program as they are in University Extension generally.

3. Credit. Closely related to this development is the problem of credit—which remains basically unsolved. Two suggestions have been made to deal with this dilemma. One is to bypass undergraduate degree credit completely and develop another kind, an Extension credit, a teaching credential credit, or a credit by any other name that would smell as sweet. Of course, Extension would pay a price for this policy. Students interested in undergraduate credit would enroll elsewhere. But the most serious flaw in this proposal is the reluctance of accrediting agencies to accept anything but the coin of the realm. "If the program is as good as you say it is, why isn't real credit offered?" Soon, credit by any other name would become second-class credit.

The other proposed solution is to offer no credit programs. To the difficulties noted above would now be added the policies of many business organizations, government agencies and school districts which pay all or part of an employee's tuition—in credit programs only. Obviously, ways have to be found to work with society's and the student's belief that credit is better somehow.

One Extension department can report progress on the latter point.

During the past few years, a very successful Engineering Extension program has been developed at University Extension, Berkeley, on an entirely non-credit basis. This has been accomplished with the active cooperation of the College of Engineering on the Berkeley campus. Doing so has involved a great deal of hard legwork by the Dean of the College, his faculty, and by the head of Engineering Extension, himself a senior member of the College faculty. There have been many conversations with officials of business, industry, and government. Each time, College staff have explained that there were important differences between curricula that led to undergraduate or graduate degrees, and an Extension offering of courses, short courses, conferences, and other programs aimed at individuals with differing needs and educational goals. The College faculty was brought in to plan programs that dealt with their own research efforts, particularly with those that practicing professionals wanted to know more about. These talks, and the success of the specially-designed programs, have resulted in new understanding of the value of non-credit programs by the engineering professions.

The Daytime Program will be doing more in the future in continuing professional education, both for credit and not for credit. The staff doubtless will be learning from Engineering Extension's experience in non-credit programming, as well as looking for models of creative programming in professional fields for credit.

4. Women's Needs. One of the assumptions originally made about Daytime Program participants was that almost all would be women. The staff expected that very few men would be able to leave work during the day. The staff was mistaken: the proportion of men was, and continues to be, much higher than predicted, although as the program expanded, the proportion declined. In 1965-66, the ratio of women to men was approximately 2.4 to 1. (The proportion of women is significantly higher in the Daytime Program than in University Extension, Berkeley, as a whole.)

There is no doubt that for the next few years, perhaps for longer than that, female students will continue to outnumber male students by a substantial margin. In recognition of this, the staff has already begun to plan more programs of continuing education for women.

Some women who now come to the Daytime Program have clearly defined "small" goals: they want courses in a foreign language, work in child or adolescent psychology, a class in oriental philosophy or pre-

Table 3

PER CENT OF FEMALE ENROLLEES, 1965-66

	Total	Male	Female	% Female
University Extension, Berkeley (All Departments)	34,500	16,130	18,370	53.2
Daytime Program	3,140	930	2,210	70.4

Columbian art. These needs are easily met. Then there are the "shoppers," women who have no clear idea of what they need or want, and who enroll in this or that course. Some stay with the Program for a long time; others give up the search and do not return. The staff would like to be able to identify these participants when they first enroll and develop a program of educational counseling for them.

There is a third group of women, chiefly housewives, who have rather definitely decided to return to work or to resume a profession, but who are vague about how to educate and prepare themselves, or refresh their skills and knowledge. In recent years some of America's most distinguished institutions of higher learning have begun to provide educational opportunities for women, primarily for this third group. The Daytime Program, too, has started to provide such opportunities.

In the Program, women can define for themselves where they want to go educationally, at a leisurely pace, one course at a time. They do not have to make the long-term commitment involved in pursuing a degree program or in preparing quickly to enter or reenter the labor market. There is now some informal contact between these students and staff, and to that extent, the Program performs a kind of counseling service. But more is needed.

The staff is now developing plans for a curriculum that focuses on the role of women in business and the professions, particularly on what has been happening to employed women during the past twenty years and what seems to be about to happen in the next twenty. Enrollees would learn more about the many ways in which American and international society have been changing and about recent developments in the sciences and the arts. The primary goal of the curriculum would be to bring these women's general knowledge of the working world up to date.

After successfully completing the curriculum, participants would move to educational and vocational counselors who would advise on next steps. Some women could be directed to specific refresher courses offered in the Daytime Program, other Extension departments, the Berkeley campus, or other colleges and universities. Some would begin a campus program leading toward an M.A. or Ph.D. degree. Still others would go directly into employment. And perhaps some would conclude that a decision about returning to work should be postponed.

The common curriculum-counseling program for women is but one idea currently under consideration. It is clear that the Daytime Program will have an increasingly important role to play in the future in the continuing education of women.

5. Financial support. From all that has been said above about the history and development of the Daytime Program and its prospects for the future, it should be clear that the financial restraints imposed upon University Extension—and the Daytime Program—will have to be eased if Extension is to meet growing community needs and demands for continuing education.

The difficulty is that at a quick glance a self-support policy for University Extension programs seems reasonable. Most Extension students are employed adults who benefit financially and in other ways from continuing education programs. Why shouldn't they pay for all costs? One has to examine this argument carefully. A self-support policy has important consequences. To begin with, break-even budgeting results in the substitution of financial for educational goals. An administrator conscious of his responsibility to the academic tradition and to society will resist the pressures longer. Often he acquires skill in manipulating funds to maximum advantage. Sooner or later, however, some capitulation to the needs of the budget is required.

A thriving Daytime Program did not become a reality until after 1964 simply because there was no risk capital available earlier. An educational and vocational counseling program for daytime students, especially for women returning to the university after years of absence, is long overdue. But such a service is expensive. And the plain fact is that although some students are able to pay these and other fees, many adults cannot afford to pay. High fees for continuing education, which will go higher with rising costs, are limiting participation to those who can af-

ford it, that is, the upper middle class. A state university has a responsibility to provide educational opportunities for the less affluent as well. Thus far, however, University Extension has not done as much as it should for them.

No one has suggested that daytime and other Extension programs be free. The student benefits and should pay part of the cost. But society also benefits, and society should share the cost with the student.

We hope that the state government will increase the level of state support for University Extension programs, that the Daytime Program will succeed in securing support from private foundations, business, and industry, and that some of the new agencies established in the federal government will assume responsibility for general support of University Extension on a scale comparable to that enjoyed by Agricultural Extension. In any case, the Daytime Program has no choice but to make large plans to provide for its own financial support.

The Daytime Program was launched on a note of optimism. Though it has had and will continue to have problems, everything that has occurred has generated more optimism. It is now clear that there are and will be educational needs in the community that can be met by the kind of program which the Daytime Program has become. For this reason alone, we look optimistically to the future.

A REACTION

by Virginia Bullard*

We are indebted to Mr. Gordon for having taken the time to document carefully and candidly the development of this new program. In this, the decade of the daytime adult program, planners, in search of support, occasionally unsure of a new idea, will obtain both assurance and ideas from this paper.

In reading "Daytime School for Adults: A New Program Dimension at University of California/Berkeley," my first reactions were enthusiastically childlike—"Me too!" "You too?" "I wish we could to that too," I kept feeling as I recognized our common experiences. Yet, our program at Northeastern grew out of an entirely different purpose, occurred on the East Coast, was (initially) directed toward women, and is offered by a private university. I mention these facts to point out to readers that many of Mr. Gordon's experiences will apply, even when geography, philosophy, and type of institution differ. Perhaps the reason for the similarity is that we both have responded to a human need. (The psychologists don't yet call this one primary, but perhaps they will in time.)

Of particular interest, I believe, is the way in which Mr. Gordon's program has used student volunteers on all levels of program development and maintenance—planning, evaluation, faculty referrals, administration, registration, and promotion. Although student protest in recent months has forced change—and student participation—in programs for "young" people, the adult students' involvement as colleagues makes enormous good sense but makes no headlines. Mr. Gordon speaks gratefully of how much their participation aids the Extension Program. This is true. Of equal importance, it seems to me, because we are in business for students and not for the enhancement of our own programs, is the professional experience such participation gives the student. Our

---

*Director of Programs for Adult Women at Northeastern University in Boston and Burlington, Massachusetts.

student volunteers in Northeastern's Program for Adult Women are promoted as experienced personnel to paid positions when openings occur; they are getting a "free course" in university administration in addition to whatever else they signed up for.

Moreover, we are on a first-name basis with many of our students which indicates the essential equality of adult students and teachers as well as the fact that teachers are also learners and learners teachers.

Of course, in spite of the respect and equality exemplified by this kind of relationship, no one can deny that the university and all it stands for is an awesome place in the minds of much of our population. To be able, through a variety of small, effortless, informal means, to make a student feel a part of this enormous, prestigious institution is a real achievement with long-range and far-reaching possibilities.

There are several other issues that Mr. Gordon touches upon which deserve discussion.

College credit, with all its ramifications, is indeed a sticky issue. In a society not noted for its contemplative nature, it is small wonder that students want credit—not only, as Mr. Gordon points out, because it suggests or insures high quality but because it insures marketability. Employers discriminate on the basis of education—as do some friends and neighbors. They do it because it is easy (discrimination is quicker than thinking), but also because educators (colleges and universities) hint subtly that they must. Education without credit will not be accepted until first-rate colleges decide that it is meaningless for everyone, not just for adults in "special programs." Since no one feels that a conference (or an outing) is the same as a course, Mr. Gordon's example of the acceptability of the non-credit Secretaries Forum '66 does not really prove his point.

Mr. Gordon was puzzled over the responses of the many men who requested professional courses in fields other than their own. It is likely that he has hit upon next year's "new dimension." Many of our women at Northeastern are completing degrees begun long ago, and they now find that their interests have changed. (The most common switch is from science to some form of social service.) Are men and women so different that we should be surprised to find that men's interests change too? And, how long are we going to continue to expect that at age 17, or 19,

or 22, a person can and must choose his or her career for a lifetime? The effect of this kind of expectation makes an individual who is dissatisfied and unfulfilled by his occupation in middle life feel guilty and maladjusted, or deviant. Within this cultural expectation, only the very strongest dare to take the next step, a step which may turn out to be a very normal one as we learn more about adult development. And in addition to career goals, as we know, men as well as women, have personal reasons for returning to school in middle life—in connection with an avocation, for example, or just to satisfy intellectual curiosity.

Many would agree with Mr. Gordon that individual educational and vocational counseling is expensive and time consuming. Another choice, one we offer at Northeastern, is group counseling. The group counseling process can very often give the participants the kind of confidence, strength, and insight they need to conduct their own vocational and educational explorations. The psychologist leader, in this case, invests approximately the same amount of time for fifteen or twenty clients as the regular instructor does for as many students. This by no means should be construed as an economic hedge—our own experience indicates that it is at least as successful, if not more so, than traditional, individual methods.

We who have begun daytime programs for adults are experiencing what must have been experienced by our predecessors a generation or more ago when evening programs began. Students do come; unexpected types of students come—and give us pause. Students, staff, and faculty are excited about their pioneering efforts. Students having taken a first step, move on to other steps which, prior to the first one, might have seemed impossible. We, staff and students alike, are grateful to have had the opportunity for innovation. The challenge lies ahead—in the press for more students, for more money, for and against becoming part of the established pattern, and for additional new dimensions.

APPENDIX

University of California Extension Center
55 Laguna Street
San Francisco

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION

SURVEY

University Extension seeks your opinions on frequency and type of course offerings for new Daytime Classes to begin February, 1964, at the Extension Center. Your response is important to us in defining the current educational needs of adults in this community and in taking specific action to fill these needs.

Whether or not you have definite plans for continuing your education at this time, please fill in the questionnaire as completely as possible and return it within the next few days. No postage is required—simply staple or tape the folded form so the Center's address is visible.

Thank you for your participation and interest.

Sincerely yours,

Edward B. Roessler

EDWARD B. ROESSLER
Director, University Extension
Northern Area

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name _____

Address _____

Age _____
6–7*

Marital Status:
8 _____ *1* Married
_____ *2* Single
_____ *3* Widowed or Divorced

How many children do you have in each of these age groups?
9 _____ Under 6 years
10 _____ 6 to 12
11 _____ 13 to 18
12 _____ 19 and over

Employment status:
13 Occupation _____
14 _____ Employed full-time
15 _____ Employed part-time
16 Employed by _____
17 _____ Self-employed full-time
18 _____ Self-employed part-time
19 _____ Not employed
20 _____ Not employed, retired
(Please give former occupation.)
21 _____

If not employed and you plan to seek employment in the foreseeable future, please specify probable occupation.
22 _____

* The numbers appearing next to the answer categories are there to facilitate machine processing.

PAST EDUCATION

Please indicate the last year of education completed:
23 _____ *1* Less than 9
_____ *2* 9–11
_____ *3* 12 (high school diploma)
_____ *4* 1–3 years college
_____ *5* 4 years college (B.A., B.S.)
_____ *6* More than 4 years with no higher degree
_____ *7* Master's degree
_____ *8* Ph.D. or equivalent

Major field of study:
24 _____

As preparation for your present responsibilities, do you feel your education so far has been:
25 _____ *1* Highly satisfactory?
_____ *2* Satisfactory?
_____ *3* Not satisfactory?

Comment, if you wish _____

FUTURE EDUCATION

Do you hope now or in the future to continue your education by following a plan of study, enrolling in particular courses, etc.?
26 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* Undecided
_____ *3* No

Below are some of the reasons adults return to classes. Please select three and rank them in order of importance to you, with #1 as most important.

27 _____ For credit
28 _____ To pursue work interest or skills
29 _____ To keep informed of new knowledge
30 _____ For a degree
31 _____ To pursue personal interests or skills
32 _____ To prepare for resuming an interrupted career
33 _____ To start a new career
34 _____ To pursue cultural interests
35 _____ To associate with adults having similar interests
36 _____ For mental stimulation
37 _____ Other (specify) _____
_____

If there are obstacles to continuing your education, which of the following are most important? (Check as many as apply.)

38 _____ Family responsibilities
39 _____ Work commitments
40 _____ Volunteer obligations
41 _____ Cost
42 _____ Limited choice of suitable courses and hours
43 _____ Other (specify) _____
_____

If daytime classes are feasible for you, please check below all convenient times for weekday, Saturday or Sunday programs:

Weekdays

44 _____ 6:30– 8:30 A.M.
45 _____ 8:00–10:00
46 _____ 9:00–11:00*
47 _____ 10:00–12:00*
48 _____ 11:00– 1:00 P.M.*
49 _____ 12:00– 2:00*
50 _____ 1:00– 3:00
51 _____ 2:00– 4:00
52 _____ 5:00– 7:00

* Mothers of school age children, please note.

Saturday

53 _____ 9:00–12:00
54 _____ 2:00– 4:00

Sunday

55 _____ morning
56 _____ afternoon

If you can consider daytime courses, what time of year would be convenient for you?

57 _____ Spring term (February–June)
58 _____ Summer term (June–August)
59 _____ Fall term (September–January)

How many hours per week† could you plan for this activity?

60 _____ *1* 6 hours
_____ *2* 9 hours
_____ *3* 12 hours or more

† Most extension classes meet for 2 to 2½ hours once a week; an average of 2 hours preparation for each 1 hour of class time is usually necessary.

YOUR PREFERENCES ON COURSE ARRANGEMENTS

Some daytime classes may be scheduled in a series, over a year, and planned around a single theme, such as "Ancient Civilizations," or "Science and the Layman," or "The Medieval World," etc.

Would a series-type course interest you?

61 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

If you could earn a certificate for such a course of study, would you be more interested in enrolling?

62 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

Would you be interested in a one-semester course covering recent developments in a field of study?

63 _____ *1* Yes (Please specify) _____
_____
_____ *2* No

Would you be interested in workshops, seminars, or other special short courses? (Examples might be "The New Math" or "The Foundations of 20th Century Political Thought.")

64 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

Would you be interested in residential 2 to 6 day conferences? (For example, "Politics 1964," given at Asilomar, Lake Tahoe, or other conference sites.)

65 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

Because of time or other limitations, would you prefer your courses arranged to allow some home study combined with semi-monthly or monthly class meetings?

66 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

Would you be interested in independent investigation in some area of study under the guidance of a faculty member?

67 _____ *1* Yes
_____ *2* No

If "Yes," in what areas?

68 _____
_____

YOUR CHOICES ON AREAS OF STUDY:

Below is a partial list of subject areas and course titles offered by University Extension. Please mark with #1 those subjects you would be interested in studying, or with #2 those you would want to study for credit.

Business Administration

6 _____ Accounting
7 _____ Insurance
8 _____ Marketing and Merchandising

9 ..... Production Management
10 ..... Finance
11 ..... Management and General Business
12 ..... Personnel and Industrial Relations

Education

13 ..... General Education Courses
14 ..... Math in the Secondary Schools
15 ..... Laws Relating to Schools and Children
16 ..... Teaching Gifted Children
17 ..... Foreign Languages and Science in Elementary Schools

Engineering and Sciences

18 ..... Architecture
19 ..... Chemistry
20 ..... Chemical Engineering
21 ..... Civil Engineering
22 ..... Electrical Engineering
23 ..... General Engineering
24 ..... Industrial Engineering
25 ..... Mathematics
26 ..... Mechanical Engineering
27 ..... Mineral Technology
28 ..... Nuclear Engineering
29 ..... Physical Science
30 ..... Statistics

Real Estate

31 ..... Trends and Factors Influencing Real Estate
32 ..... Legal Aspects of Real Estate
33 ..... Property Management
34 ..... Essentials of Residential Design and Structure
35 ..... Brokerage Administration and Procedure

Liberal Arts

36 ..... Anthropology
37 ..... Art and Architecture
38 ..... Classics
39 ..... Comparative Literature
40 ..... Criminology
41 ..... Decorative Art
42 ..... Dramatic Art
43 ..... English
44 ..... Languages (Romance, Oriental, Slavic, Scandinavian, Classical)
45 ..... History
46 ..... Philosophy
47 ..... Geography
48 ..... Journalism
49 ..... Music
50 ..... Political Science
51 ..... Psychology
52 ..... Sociology
53 ..... Speech
54 ..... Zoology

Social Welfare

55 ..... Interrelationship of the Social Services
56 ..... Human Relations in the Social Services
57 ..... Helping Individuals and Groups
58 ..... Seminar on Problems in the Social Services
59 ..... Child Care Practice in Institutions
60 ..... The Team Approach to Child Care Practice
61 ..... Principles and Practices in Residential Care for the Aging

What other general areas (or course titles) would you like to see included in the Center's new Daytime Program?

62 .....

.....

.....

.....

Do you now receive course announcements from University Extension?

63 ..... *1* Yes. (If there are additional ones in the list below which you would care to receive, please check those wanted.)
..... *2* No. (If you wish to have your name placed on the mailing list, please check those areas wanted in the list below.)
64 ..... Business Administration
65 ..... Education
66 ..... Engineering and Sciences
67 ..... Real Estate
68 ..... Liberal Arts
69 ..... Social Welfare
70 ..... New Daytime Classes
71 ..... City and Regional Planning
72 ..... Special Lectures, Workshops, Weekend Conferences
73 ..... Correspondence Courses

For further details or additional questionnaires, write or telephone: Coordinator, Daytime Program, University of California Extension Center, 55 Laguna Street, San Francisco 2, California (UNderhill 1-5452).

THE LIBRARY OF

SEP 13 1967

CONTINUING EDUCATION

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

2-15-68